

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 1-39 without prejudice. Please add new Claims 40 and 41. Claims 40 and 41 are now pending in the application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Liu et al. (U.S. Patent 6,049,336). The Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 4 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Ko (U.S. Patent 6,430,314). The Examiner has rejected Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Sudo (U.S. Patent 5,905,964). The Examiner has rejected Claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Sudo, and further in view of Hino et al. (U.S. Patent 5,703,947). The Examiner has rejected Claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Sudo, and further in view of Hino et al., and further in view of Steele et al. (U.S. Patent 6,201,534). The Examiner has rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Steele et al. The Examiner has rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Sudo, and further in view of Steele et al. The Examiner has rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Steele et al., and further in view of Hino et al. The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Steele et al., and further in view of Hino et al. The Examiner has rejected Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Steele et al., further in view of Hino et al., and further in view of Nakanishi (U.S. Patent 6,064,725). The Examiner has rejected Claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Steele et al., further in view of Hino et al., and further in view of Ko et al. (U.S. Patent 6,300,934). The Examiner has rejected Claims 33-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi in view of Hino et al., further in view of Ko, and further in view of Steele et al.

As none of the rejected claims are remaining after cancellation of Claims 1-39, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-39 is respectfully requested.

Regarding new independent Claim 40, it is believed that this claim is in condition for allowance as none of the cited references teaches or discloses generating at least one input signal by performing at least one of the following multi-function key manipulations: a) pressing the

protrusion of the multi-function key at least once, b) sliding the protrusion of the multi-function key in the first direction, and c) sliding the protrusion of the multi-function key in the second direction, wherein the at least one input signal is used to performing at least one of a) navigating through the at least one hierarchal menu, b) selecting a function, and c) inputting digits/characters.

It is submitted that the specific elements recited in new Claim 40 are neither taught nor disclosed by the cited references, either alone or in combination.

Independent Claim 40 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claim 41, this is likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependence on its respective amended independent claims.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 40 and 41, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM:lb